



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,207	02/25/2002	Marlon D. Cowart	6791.US.02	2847
23492	7590	01/14/2004	EXAMINER	
STEVEN F. WEINSTOCK ABBOTT LABORATORIES 100 ABBOTT PARK ROAD DEPT. 377/AP6A ABBOTT PARK, IL 60064-6008			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1624		
DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,207	COWART ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-164 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 48,55-60,74-76,87-102 and 112-126 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-47,49-54,61-73,77-86,103-111 and 127-164 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 45 . 6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-164 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-47, 49-54, 61-73, 77-86, 103-111, 127-164 wherein A is a covalent bond and D is oxygen in Paper filed on 10/23/2003, is acknowledged. In addition election of species of example 1 is also acknowledged. Claims 1-47, 49-54, 61-73, 77-86, 103-111, 127-164 will be examined to the extent they embrace the elected subject matter. Claims 48, 55-60, 74-76, 87-102, and 112-126 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected subject matter.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-47, 49-54, 61-73, 77-86, 103-111, 127-164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reasons apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

1. Recitation of the term "prodrug" in claims 1, 43, 103, 127, 132,136, and 144 is deemed as indefinite. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various R, groups include such groups, namely esters, amides, carbamoyl etc. and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. Thus there is an ambiguity as to when a group such as ester to treated as prodrug group when not as prodrug group.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 153-164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating gastrointestinal disorders, obesity, sleep disorder and asthma requiring histamine-3 receptor does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment all or any disease as embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims are drawn to "a method of treating a disorder wherein the disorder is ameliorated by modulating histamine-3 receptor or selectively modulating the effects of histamine-3-receptors" which as recited reads on any or all disorders for which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims includes treatment of any or all

of diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 29-32. The instant compounds are disclosed have histamine-3 receptor inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are useful in treating several diseases, for which applicants provide no competent evidence. Reading specification it appears that instant compound is useful for treating all sorts of disorders/diseases including Alzheimer's disease, bipolar disorder, all cognitive disorders, septic shock etc. for which applicants have not provided any experimental support. Moreover many if not most of central nervous system diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, multiple sclerosis etc. are very difficult to treat. For multiple sclerosis alone there is no known drug, which can successfully reverse the course of the disease, despite the fact that there are many drugs which can be used for "inflammatory condition" etc. for which applicants have not provided any experimental support. Even a recent reviews of histamine-3 receptors suggest the use of these antagonists still under experimental stage and speculative in nature. See Repka-Ramirez Curr. Allergy. Asthma Rep. 3(3): 227-31, 2003 and Barocelli et al. Pharmacol. Res. 47(4): 299-304, 2003 (PubMed Abstract provided). Even the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, at the time of the instant invention suggest use of these antagonists still under experimental stage and speculative in nature. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d

1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating diseases that require histamine-3 receptor inhibitory activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: A very recent publication expressed that the histamine-3 receptor inhibitors are still in experimental stage.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for the therapeutic effect of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the

degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

- 4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show preventive effect and the state of the art is that the effects of histamine-3 receptor antagonists are unpredictable.
- 6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace treatment of several diseases.
- 7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards 'preventing' the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-47, 49-54, 61-73, 77-86, 103-111, 127-164 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-71 of copending Application No. 10/0044,495. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims also embraced in the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statements (papers dated 3/24/2003, 5/4/2003) are made off record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (703) 305-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (703) 308-4716.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

V. Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

01/09/2004